arXiv:1604.02011v3 [quant-ph] 13 Jul 2016

Do objective results typically appear in quantum measurements?

J. K. Korbicz,[1,2,*] E. A. Aguilar,[3] P. Ćwikliński,[3] and P. Horodecki[1,2]

[1]*Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics, Gdańsk University of Technology, 80-233 Gdańsk*
[2]*National Quantum Information Centre in Gdańsk, 81-824 Sopot, Poland*
[3]*Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk,*
National Quantum Information Centre in Gdańsk, 81-824 Sopot, Poland

(Dated: July 14, 2016)

Measurement is of central interest in quantum mechanics as it provides the link between the quantum world and the world of everyday experience. One of the features of the latter is its robust, objective character, contrasting the delicate nature of quantum systems. Here we analyze in a model-independent way a measurement process and give an affirmative answer to the question posed in the title, provided we coarse-grain the measuring apparatus and we wait long enough. As a typicality measure we use the celebrated Gaussian Unitary Ensemble of random matrices and the objectivization is characterized by the recently introduced, so-called, Spectrum Broadcast Structures. For large-dimensional measured systems, we provide typical timescales of the objectivization.

PACS numbers: 05.30.-d 03.67.-a 03.65.Yz
Keywords: Decoherence, Objectivity, Random Matrix Theory

I. INTRODUCTION

The precise control of quantum systems is of key importance in building reliable quantum devices. When controlling quantum systems, quantum coherences, the crucial aspect of quantum physics that is represented in the iconic Schrödinger's cat thought experiment, are of special interest and importance. They are an essential ingredient in quantum information processing as it enables applications that are impossible within classical mechanics or ray optics. They play a central role in emergent fields, such as quantum metrology [1, 2], quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics [3–8], quantum biology [9–12] and nanotechnology and nanoelectronics [13–15]. Researchers have even started developing a framework devoted only to study and understand quantum coherences - a resource theory of coherences [16]. In this setting, coherence is regarded as a precious resource that cannot be generated or increased under a restricted class of operations known as incoherent operations.

Unfortunately, coherences are a very fragile resource. They are easily destroyed since the system whose coherent dynamics one wants to manipulate, interacts with an environment that smoothly degrades its quantum dynamics. This process is called decoherence. Environment induced decoherence constitutes the main obstacle towards reliable quantum devices, as the loss of coherence may weaken the abilities of a state to perform quantum information processing tasks. That's why, a precise understanding of its inner mechanisms and features [17] (especially, protecting the fragility of quantumness) is critical to develop strategies to control the quantum dynamics. What is more, decoherence is crucial to the studies of very fundamental physics, namely the classical-quantum border and the emergence of classicality [18–22]. The basic idea is that classicality is an emergent property induced in open quantum systems by their environments. Due to the interaction with the environment, the vast majority of states in the Hilbert space of a quantum open system become highly unstable to entangling interaction with the environment, which in effect monitors selected observables of the system. After a decoherence time, a generic quantum state decays into a mixture of "pointer states". This concept has been of considerable use in quantum cosmology. There, the quantum universe is the only system that is effectively closed and does not possess any external environment. See, for example, [23], for a develop-



FIG. 1: (Color online) The central system S is coupled to N i.i.d. environments E_i, each one interacting with the central system through the von Neumann measurement Hamiltonian (1)

*Electronic address: jkorbicz@mif.pg.gda.pl

ment of the decoherent (consistent) histories approach for quantum cosmology in an attempt to answer questions regarding the emergence of the classical universe from an underlying quantum one.

One of the aspects of the emergence of classicality is the appearance of objective quantities from quantum theory. It is well known that a quantum measurement in general disturbs the system, while in the world of everyday experience such a disturbance is not observed. This problem has been analyzed before e.g. in quantum Darwinism approach [18] and in other related works [20, 24]. In the [20] a possible solution has been proposed in terms of the so-called Spectrum Broadcast Structures (SBS), which are specific multipartite quantum state structures encoding some form of operational objectivity (we introduce them briefly in the next Section). So far they have been shown to appear in two emblematic models of decoherence: The illuminated sphere [19], in recoil-less regimes of quantum Brownian motion [25–27], and in spin-spin models [28].

A question arises if those structures, and hence objective properties, are typically formed in more general, model-independent settings. In this work we study general von Neumann type measurements. As the measure of typicality we use the well-known Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) of random matrices [29, 30] (for a somewhat similar approach to the thermodynamical equilibration see e.g. [31, 32]). Discarding a part of the measuring apparatus/environment, which represents unavoidable losses, we average over the measuring/environmental observable first and derive exact expressions for the averages of the resulting decoherence factor and the, so-called, super-fidelity [33] of apparatus/environmental states, which bounds how well these states can be distinguished. We then use them to show our central result: A coarse-grained state between the measured system and an observed part of its measuring apparatus/environment typically approaches a SBS for large enough interaction times, with the error exponentially small in the coarse-graining size. By [20] this is equivalent to a redundant proliferation of the measurement results in the apparatus/environment, which in turn leads to their objectivization. For large-dimensional measured systems, we estimate the timescale of this process to be of the order $(g\sqrt{d})^{-1}$, where g is the effective coupling constant and d is some apparatus local dimension.

Decoherence has already been studied using random matrix theory in different regimes. For example, if we write the total Hamiltonian as the sum of system, environment and interaction, $H = H_S + H_E + H_I$, then in [34] both H_E and H_I were chosen from the GUE, in [35] they explored separable coupling $H_I = V_S \otimes V_E$ with both V_E and H_E from the GUE (and $[V_S, H_S] \neq 0$), and in [36] the full Hamiltonian H was chosen from the GUE without further structure. However, the purity of the central system, its von Neumann entropy, as well as some features of non-Markovianity have been the central interests of these works. In particular, the universality of decoherence has already been studied (albeit in a different setting) e.g. in [37–40]. Moreover, timescales of decoherence have been addressed before, for example, in [41], where it has been shown analyzed in the Stern-Gerlach setup, in different temperature limits or in [42], where it has been studied in a general setting in the weak interactions limit in the case of intrinsic decoherence (decoherence in closed systems).

However decoherence alone does not guarantee that information about the system becomes redundantly stored in the measuring apparata/environment and can be extracted without a disturbance, which are prerequisites for the perceived objectivity of the measurement results. A deeper analysis must be performed. Below we present such an analysis.

II. THE SETUP AND SPECTRUM BROADCAST STRUCTURES (SBS)

We will consider a situation where a quantum system of interest S interacts with multiple, independent environments $E_1, \ldots, E_N$ in a such a way that there are no direct interactions between the parts of the environment; see Fig. 1. This setup is fundamental for the decoherence and open quantum system theories and is encountered in well-known models such as quantum Brownian motion, spin-spin and spin-boson models, and collisional decoherence [22] to name a few. It is also fundamental for quantum Darwinism [18] and the subsequent Spectrum Broadcast Structure approach to objectivity [19, 20, 25], which is of special interest for us in this work. Throughout the work we will assume that the system and the environments are finite dimensional, all the environments have the same dimension d (this is a technical simplification not affecting our results) and the system is d_S-dimensional. As already mentioned, we will consider the situation of a von Neumann measurement, when the individual dynamics of both the system and the environment can be neglected and the interaction Hamiltonian predominates [43] (for objectivity-related studies with this assumption relaxed see [25]), so that:

$$\hat{H}_{tot} \approx \hat{H}_{int} = \hat{A} \otimes \sum_{k=1}^{N} \hat{B}_k \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{A}$, $\hat{B}_k$, are some observables of the system and the k-th environment respectively and we will assume $\hat{A}$ to have a non-degenerate spectrum. This interaction type is common in the theory of open quantum systems and can be found e.g. in the models mentioned above. One can interpret it as describing a measurement of the system observable $\hat{A}$ by a collection of N measuring apparata, coupled through the observables $\hat{B}_k$. These are the only assumptions we will need at this moment.

The dynamics induced by the Hamiltonian (1) is of the so-called controlled-unitary type (we set $\hbar = 1$), with the system controlling the environment through the eigenvalues a of the observable $\hat{A}$:

$$\hat{U} \equiv \mathrm{e}^{-it\hat{H}_{tot}} = \sum_a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \bigotimes_{k=1}^{N} \mathrm{e}^{-ia\hat{B}_k t}, \tag{2}$$

where $|a\rangle$ are the eigenvectors of $\hat{A}$, corresponding to the eigenvalues a, $\hat{A} = \sum_a a|a\rangle\langle a|$. We will assume a completely uncorrelated initial state:

$$\rho_0 = \rho_{0S} \otimes \bigotimes_{k=1}^{N} \rho_{0k}, \tag{3}$$

as it is usually done and will allow us to better track the correlations established between the system and the environment. Following the quantum Darwinism approach [18], we do not treat the environment merely as a source of decoherence and noise, but are interested in the information about the system gained by the portions of the environment during the interaction. Hence, a part of the environment, denoted E_{obs}, is left for a potential observation and cannot be traced out. The rest, denoted E_{uno}, is assumed to escape unobserved. Thus, our main object of the study is a partially reduced state $\rho_{S:E_{obs}}$, with only a fraction E_{uno} of a size N_{uno} of the environment traced out [19, 20, 25]:

$$\rho_{S:E_{obs}}(t) = \mathrm{Tr}_{E_{uno}} \left[\hat{U}\rho_{0S} \otimes \bigotimes_{k=1}^{N} \rho_{0k} \hat{U}^{\dagger} \right] \tag{4}$$

The partial loss of the environments induces a decrease of coherences between each pair of states $|a\rangle$ and $|a'\rangle$, described by the cumulative decoherence factor due to E_{uno} (we are interested here only in the modulus squared of it):

$$\Gamma^{uno}_{a,a'}(t) \equiv \prod_{k=1}^{N_{uno}} \left| \mathrm{Tr}[\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}_k t} \rho_{0k}] \right|^2. \tag{5}$$

We stress that the decoherence factor depends only on the unobserved fraction E_{uno} of the environment. If the decoherence takes place, i.e. there is a timescale τ_{dec} such that for $t \gg \tau_{dec}$ and for any pair a, a':

$$\Gamma^{uno}_{a,a'}(t) = 0, \tag{6}$$

then the partially traced state takes a simple form:

$$\rho_{S:E_{obs}}(t) = \sum_a p_a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \bigotimes_{k \in E_{obs}} \rho_{ak}(t), \tag{7}$$

where $p_a \equiv \langle a|\rho_{0S}|a\rangle$ and:

$$\rho_{ak}(t) \equiv \mathrm{e}^{-ia\hat{B}_k t} \rho_{0k} \mathrm{e}^{ia\hat{B}_k t}. \tag{8}$$

The eigenbasis $|a\rangle$ of $\hat{A}$ becomes then the, so-called pointer basis, in which the state of the system decoheres: $\rho_S = \sum_a p_a |a\rangle\langle a|$. Information about the system—the value of the index a, which has leaked into the environment is encoded in the states (8). If they happen to have orthogonal supports for different a's:

$$\rho_{ak} \perp \rho_{a'k}, \tag{9}$$

then they become one-shot perfectly distinguishable and the index a can be read off any portion of the environment, without disturbing the joint state $\rho_{S:E_{obs}}$. This in turn leads to a form of objectivity of the state $|a\rangle$ in the sense of *observer independence*: Observation of any portion of the environment will give the same result a (assuming the right measurement is used–the projections on the supports of ρ_{ak}) without any disturbance neither to the system nor to other observers [18–20]. If the conditions (6) and (9) are satisfied, the state (7) has a particular structure, called Spectrum Broadcast Structure (SBS) [19, 20] with respect to the observable $\hat{A}$ (or more precisely its eigenbasis; this context-dependence is of a fundamental importance, see e.g. [44]). From a quantum-information point of view, SBS describes a process of a broadcasting of the classical message $\{p_a\}$ (the spectrum of the reduced states ρ_S), into the environment and can be viewed as a much weaker form of quantum state broadcasting [45].

Quite surprisingly, a form of the converse statement is also true [20]: Demanding state objectivity in the above sense, leads uniquely (under some additional assumptions) to SBS. In this sense SBS are important objects as they are responsible for the appearance of classical objective properties in quantum mechanics. Here we analyze if such states are typically formed during the von Neumann measurement evolution (1).

Before we proceed, we elaborate on the condition (9). It may happen that the individual states (8) are poorly distinguishable but states of coarse-grained portions of the observed environment E_{obs}, called macrofractions and denoted $mac_1, \ldots, mac_M$, do approach a perfect distinguishability [19]. In other words, if the information is diluted in the environment a collective approach may help. Hence, when looking for the SBS we will allow for coarse-graining of the environment and will consider distinguishability of macrofraction states:

$$\rho^{mac}_a(t) \equiv \bigotimes_{k \in mac} \rho_{ak}(t). \tag{10}$$

The latter is most conveniently measured by the (square of) the fidelity [19, 45, 46], as it scales with the tensor product in (10):

$$F(\rho_a, \rho_{a'}) \equiv \left(\mathrm{Tr} \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_a}\rho_{a'}\sqrt{\rho_a}} \right)^2 = ||\sqrt{\rho_a}\sqrt{\rho_{a'}}||^2_{Tr}, \tag{11}$$

where $||\cdot||_{Tr}$ stands for the trace norm. Thus, our cen-

tral objects of study will be the decoherence factor (5) and the macrofraction fidelity:

$$F^{mac}_{a,a'}(t) \equiv F\left(\rho^{mac}_a(t), \rho^{mac}_{a'}(t)\right) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{mac}} F\left(\rho_{ak}(t), \rho_{a'k}(t)\right) \tag{12}$$

and their simultaneous vanishing indicates a formation of a SBS but on the coarse-grained level now:

$$\rho_{S:E_{obs}}(t) \to \rho_{SBS} = \sum_a p_a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \rho^{mac_1}_a \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho^{mac_M}_a,$$
$$\text{with } \rho^{mac}_a \perp \rho^{mac}_{a'} \text{ for each mac and } a' \neq a. \tag{13}$$

III. TYPICAL BEHAVIOR FOR RANDOM MEASUREMENT HAMILTONIANS

To investigate if a SBS formation is typical for the measurement Hamiltonians (1) we will assume the latter to be randomly chosen from some statistical ensemble preserving its structure and then study the ensemble averages of the decoherence factor (5) and the fidelity (11). To this end we will use the well-known Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) [29, 30] in the following way: i) we assume random symmetric interactions in the sense that all the environment observables $\hat{B}_k$ are independently, identically distributed (i.i.d.) according to GUE; ii) the measured observable $\hat{A}$ is also distributed according to its own GUE.

We will first perform the average over the environment observables $\hat{B}_k$, fixing the measured observable eigenvalues a, a'. Due to the assumed i.i.d. property, the averages of the decoherence and fidelity factors factorize within their respective macrofractions (cf. (5,10,11)):

$$\left\langle \Gamma^{uno}_{a,a'}(t) \right\rangle_E = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{uno}} \left\langle \left| \mathrm{Tr}[e^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}_k t}\rho_{0k}] \right|^2 \right\rangle_{E_k}, \tag{14}$$

$$\left\langle F\left(\rho^{mac}_a(t), \rho^{mac}_{a'}(t)\right)\right\rangle_E = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{mac}} \left\langle F\left(\rho_{ak}(t), \rho_{a'k}(t)\right)\right\rangle_{E_k}, \tag{15}$$

where N_{mac} is the size of the macrofraction *mac*, and modulo the initial states ρ_{0k} all the factors are identical. Hence, in what follows we will study averages over a single environment only, denoting ρ_{0k} by ρ_E for simplicity. Later we will also average over the initial states, assuming they are i.i.d.

Unlike decoherence factor (5), fidelity (11) is a complicated function of the states. It what follows, we will use the so-called super-fidelity bound [33]:

$$F(\rho,\sigma) \leq G(\rho,\sigma) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho\sigma) + \sqrt{(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2)(1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\sigma^2)}. \tag{16}$$

It is not tight if both states are mixed, as e.g. for $\rho \perp \sigma$, their super-fidelity is non-zero. We will nevertheless use it due to its computability. Since the states (8) differ only by a unitary rotation, superfidelity takes the following form (we neglect the environment index k as we now study a single environment):

$$G\left(\rho_a(t), \rho_{a'}(t)\right) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_a(t)\rho_{a'}(t)\right) + (1 - \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E) \equiv G_{a,a'}(t). \tag{17}$$

where the last term is the linear entropy of the initial state of the individual environment $S_{lin}(\rho_E) \equiv 1 - \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E$.

A. Average over the environment

We recall that the GUE measure is of the form [29, 30]:

$$\mathrm{d}\mu_{gue}(\hat{H}) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\eta \sum_i \lambda_i^2} \prod_{i<j} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda} \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}} \tag{18}$$

where Z is the normalization factor, λ_i are the eigenvalues rescaled with an arbitrary scale η, and $\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ is the Haar measure on the unitary group. We will first perform the average over the Haar measure and then over the eigenvalues.

We commence by diagonalizing the environment observable: $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{B} \hat{U} = \mathrm{diag}[\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d]$, where the λ_i are the eigenvalues of $\hat{B}$, so that the single environment decoherence factor (14) and the super-fidelity (17) read:

$$\Gamma_{a,a'}(t) = \mathrm{Tr}[(\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger)(\rho_E \otimes \rho_E)(\hat{U} \otimes \hat{U})(\hat{D} \otimes \hat{D}^\dagger)],$$
$$G_{a,a'}(t) - S_{lin}(\rho_E) =$$
$$= \mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{V}(\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger)(\rho_E \otimes \rho_E)(\hat{U} \otimes \hat{U})(\hat{D} \otimes \hat{D}^\dagger)] \tag{19}$$

where:

$$\hat{D} \equiv \mathrm{diag}\left[e^{-i\Delta_t \lambda_1}, \ldots, e^{-i\Delta_t \lambda_d}\right], \tag{20}$$

$\Delta_t \equiv (a - a')t$, and $\mathbb{V}$ is the swap operator, defined as $\mathbb{V}|i\rangle|j\rangle = |j\rangle|i\rangle$. We are now ready to perform the average over the Haar distributed unitaries $\hat{U}$. Leaving the details to Appendix A, we quote the result:

Fact 1. *The Haar measure average of the single copy decoherence factor and super-fidelity (19) read:*

$$\langle \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{\hat{\mathcal{U}}} = \frac{d\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E - 1}{d^2 - 1} + |\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}|^2 \frac{d - \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E}{d(d^2-1)}, \tag{21}$$

$$\langle G_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{\hat{\mathcal{U}}} = S_{lin}(\rho_E) + \frac{d - \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E}{d^2 - 1}$$
$$+ |\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}|^2 \frac{d\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho^2_E - 1}{d(d^2-1)} \tag{22}$$

where d is the local dimension of the environment and ρ_E its initial state.

For pure ρ_E both fidelity and decoherence factor become of course equal so that vanishing of the latter already implies a formation of the SBS. We also note that both (21, 22) depend on the initial state only through its purity $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2$. We can thus use known results on typical state purity to effectively get rid of the initial state dependence. Although there is no canonical choice of measure over mixed states, there are several possible measures distinguished by different mathematical and physical arguments. We quote the results for two popular measures, induced by the respective metrics: The Hilbert-Schmidt and the Bures measures [47]:

$$\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle_{HS} = \frac{2d}{d^2+1}, \tag{23}$$

$$\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle_{Bu} = \frac{5d^2+1}{2d(d^2+2)}. \tag{24}$$

We can thus substitute in the expressions (21, 22) $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2$ with one of the above averages $\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle$. Assuming for simplicity (and in line with our symmetric environments approach) that the environmental initial states are i.i.d. with one of the above measures, turns the products over the environments in (14,15) into respective powers of single-copy GUE averages $\langle\cdot\rangle_{gue}$, depending on $\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle$.

After performing the averages with respect to the Haar measure, we calculate the average over the environment observable eigenvalue distribution as per the GUE measure (18). Notice that from (21), (22) only the term $|\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}|^2$ depends on the eigenvalue distribution and from (20) it reads:

$$|\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}|^2 = d + 2f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \tag{25}$$

$$f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \equiv \sum_{n<m} \cos\left[\Delta_t(\lambda_n-\lambda_m)\right]. \tag{26}$$

To perform the average of $f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ over the GUE eigenvalue distribution $P_{gue}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = (1/Z)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\eta_E\sum_i\lambda_i^2}\prod_{i<j}(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)^2$, let us first note that both the function and the measure are symmetric functions of $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d$ (the first most easily seen from (25)). Thus the average $\langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle$ will involve only the integration with the so-called two-point correlation function [30] $R_2(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) \equiv d!/(d-2)!\int\cdots\int \mathrm{d}\lambda_3\cdots\mathrm{d}\lambda_d P_{gue}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d)$. Although the large-$d$ asymptotics of this function are well known and are given by compact expressions involving elementary functions [30], they are of no use in our situation for the following reason. One can show that [30] $R_2(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = K(\lambda_1,\lambda_1)K(\lambda_2,\lambda_2) - [K(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)]^2$. The first term involves level densities and approaches for large d the well-known Wigner semicircle distribution, perfectly integrable with (26). However, the second term approaches a function depending only on the difference $|\lambda_1-\lambda_2|$ making the integral divergent. In other words, for the second term the integration with (26) and the large-d limit are not interchangeable. We are thus forced to perform the integration explicitly.

This can be done using the standard methods of random matrix theory [29, 30] and the result reads (see Appendix B for the details):

$$\langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle = p(d,\tilde{\Delta}_t)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{\Delta}_t^2}, \tag{27}$$

$$p(d,\tilde{\Delta}_t) \equiv \sum_{n<m}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{l=0}^{m}\binom{n}{k}\binom{m}{l}\frac{(-1)^{n+m-k-l}\tilde{\Delta}_t^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(n-k)!(m-l)!} - \sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{l=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}\binom{m}{l}\frac{(-1)^{k+l}\tilde{\Delta}_t^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(m-k)!(n-l)!}\right], \tag{28}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Delta}_t \equiv \frac{\Delta_t}{\sqrt{2\eta_E}} = \frac{(a-a')t}{\sqrt{2\eta_E}}, \tag{29}$$

and η_E is the environment observable eigenvalue scale (cf. (18)). We thus obtain our first main result:

Result 1. *The GUE and the initial state averages of the single environment decoherence factor and superfidelity read:*

$$\langle \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue} = \frac{1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle}{d+1} + \langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle\frac{2(d-\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle)}{d(d^2-1)}, \tag{30}$$

$$\langle G_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue} = \langle S_{lin}(\rho_E)\rangle + \frac{1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle}{d+1} + \langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle\frac{2(d\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle-1)}{d(d^2-1)}, \tag{31}$$

with $\langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle$ *given by (27,28),* $\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle$ *by* (23) *or* (24), *and* $S_{lin}(\rho_E) \equiv 1-\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2$.

The Gaussian factor in (27) implies that the time dependent part above vanishes with time for any fixed dimension d and a gap $|a-a'| \neq 0$ as $p(d,\tilde{\Delta}_t)$ is an even polynomial of degree $2(2d-3)$. In Appendix D, we show that a characteristic time of this decay is:

$$\tau_{a,a'} = \frac{\sqrt{2\eta_E}}{|a-a'|\sqrt{(d+1)}}. \tag{32}$$

B. Residual noise and macrofractions

For $t \gg \tau_{a,a'}$ what is left in (30, 31) are the constant terms: A common term of the order $O(1/d)$, which we will call the "white noise factor", and additionally for the super-fidelity the average linear entropy of the initial environment state $\langle S_{lin}(\rho_E)\rangle$. The latter, arising from the non-tight bound (16), is intuitively understood—the noisier the environment is initially, the lesser information, as measured by the state distinguishability, it can accumulate. These factors, reflecting

residual background fluctuations in the ensemble, determine a deviation from an ideal SBS (7,9) and their time-independent character means that strictly speaking there is no ideal SBS formation at any time. However, this deviation can be made arbitrary small by passing to macroscopic fractions of the environment, i.e. considering portions scaling with the total number N of the environments, as we have described in the previous Section (cf. (10,14,15)). This will induce an exponential decay of the constant factors leading to:

$$[\langle \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue}]^{N_{uno}} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} O\left(d^{-N_{uno}}\right), \tag{33}$$

$$[\langle G_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue}]^{N_{mac}} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} O\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{N_{mac}}{d}}\right). \tag{34}$$

In the thermodynamic-type of a limit $N \to \infty$, usually assumed at some point, these errors will be vanishingly small and the state will approach the SBS form (13) (cf. [19]). We note that increasing the local dimension d of the environments will not suffice—while it will damp the white noise, but the average linear entropy will tend to unity as $1 - O(1/d)$ by (23,24). Thus, we are led to consider macrofractions.

C. The main result: Typicality of SBS formation

The results (30, 31) apply to a given pair of levels of the measured observable $\hat{A}$ and depend on the spacing $s \equiv |a - a'|$ through (29). In order to study a completely general behavior, an averaging of the macrofraction quantities $[\langle \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue}]^{N_{uno}}, [\langle F_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue}]^{N_{mac}}$ over this level spacing must be performed. The resulting integral is way too complicated to be performed analytically. Instead, we will assume that the system dimension d_S is large so that for all practical purposes one may use the celebrated Wigner's surmise (the exact distribution for $d_S = 2$):

$$P_{Wig}(s) = \frac{1}{Z_S} s^2\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\eta_S}{2}s^2}, \tag{35}$$

with η_S the eigenvalue scale of the system observable. It has a RMS-error with the asymptotic expression of the order 10^{-4} [29]. But even with such a simplification the exact integral of (27) is still rather elaborate and not illuminating due to the algebraic complexity of the macrofraction power of (28). What however can be done analytically is a short-time analysis. Leaving the details to the Appendix C, we find that:

Fact 2. *For times $t \ll \tau_0$, where*

$$\tau_0 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2\eta_S\eta_E}{3(d+1)}} \tag{36}$$

the Wigner surmise (35) averaged macrofraction functions behave like:

$$\int ds P_{Wig}(s)[\langle X(t)\rangle_{gue}]^{N_f} \approx$$
$$c^{N_f} + \frac{d(d-1)}{2} N_f c^{N_f-1} \alpha\, \mathrm{e}^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau_0}\right)^2}, \tag{37}$$

where $X(t) = \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)$ or $G_{a,a'}(t)$, c, α are the respective constant and the multiplicative factors from (30) or (31), and $N_f = N_{uno}$ or N_{mac}.

Combining this with Result 1, the estimations of the residual noise level (33,34), and the bound (16) we arrive at our central result:

Result 2. *Let the local dimension of the environment be d, the unobserved fraction size N_{uno} and the observed environment divided into macrofractions of size N_{mac}. Then the system-environment and the initial condition averaged macrofraction functions (5) and (12) approach values exponentially vanishing with the respective fraction sizes as:*

$$\langle\langle \Gamma^{uno}(t)\rangle\rangle_{SE} = O\left(\mathrm{e}^{-N_{uno}\log d}\right), \tag{38}$$

$$\langle\langle\, F^{mac}(t)\rangle\rangle_{SE} = O\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{N_{mac}}{d}}\right). \tag{39}$$

For large dimensional central systems, this happens for times $t \gg \tau_0$ (36). As a consequence, the coarse-grained partially traced state (4) typically approaches the SBS form (13) with respect to the measured observable and with the error given by the above functions.

This implies that during the von Neumann measurement type of evolution (1), coarse-grained spectrum broadcast structures (13) with respect to the measured observable $\hat{A}$ are typically approached, which in turn gives rise to the objectification of the measurement results, as we have explained in Section II.

Interestingly, the macrofraction sizes affect in the first place only the error level, while the speed of approach to it is largely macrofraction-independent. This is confirmed by plotting the exact integrals and is shown in Fig. 2 for different d and macrofraction sizes (cf. Fig. 2 (a) and (c) or (b) and (d)).

D. Remarks on non-Markovianity

The plots in Fig. 2 show a characteristic non-monotonic behavior of both the average decoherence and super-fidelity. Most clearly it is seen in Fig. 2 (a): Initially the coherences decay (the lower dashed curve). This is accompanied by an increase of the system-related information in the environment as signalized by the decrease of the fidelity (the upper solid curve) i.e. the increase of the state distinguishability. At the minimum, which occurs for the time of the order of τ_0 (36), the partially traced state is the closest to SBS.



(a) $d = 2$, $N_f = 1$ (b) $d = 8$, $N_f = 1$

(c) $d = 2$, $N_f = 20$ (d) $d = 8$, $N_f = 20$

FIG. 2: (Color online). Fully GUE averaged decoherence factor (dashed-blue) and the super-fidelity (solid-red) as functions of time. We assumed the Bures average purity (24) and the Wigner surmise (35). In both (c) and (d), an environment macrofraction of the same size N_f for both functions was taken. The timescale is given in units of the effective interaction strength $g^{-1} \equiv \sqrt{\eta_S \eta_E}$.

Then the situation reverses and the system starts to partially recover the coherences while the information content of the environment decreases. This non-monotonic behavior is a signature of non-Markovian character of the evolution (see e.g. [48, 49] for general ideas and e.g. [50, 51] for concrete models). In particular, a measure for quantifying non-Markovianity proposed in [52] is exactly based on the idea of observing revivals in coherences.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We analyzed a general von Neumann measurement process (1) from the perspective of producing objective measurement results. We considered a realistic situation of a measuring apparatus/environment composed of a large number of individual subsystems, where a measurement result of some observable appears as objective if it is stored in many copies in a large group of this subsystems and is extractable without any further disturbance. As a signature of this we used, so-called, spectrum broadcast structures (SBS) (13)—a specific quantum state structures, which by the results of [20] are equivalent to a redundant information storage and its non-demolition extraction from the measuring apparata/environment. The main question we asked was if SBS are typical for von Neumann measurement processes. To this end we studied properly structured, random measurement Hamiltonians, with typicality measure constructed from the celebrated Gaussian Unitary Ensembles, and random initial states. We found that after coarse-graining, reflecting some sort of a macroscopic level, typical evolved states do indeed asymptotically approach SBS with the error exponentially small in the coarse-graining size. If the observed system is large-dimensional, the typical timescale of this process is of the order $(g\sqrt{d})^{-1}$, where g is the effective coupling constant and d the dimension of an individual (microscopic) measuring apparatus/environment. This is a very general result, not depending on the details of the measuring process. In this sense, general von Neumann measurements typically produce objective outcomes.

Plots of the obtained analytical results clearly showed a non-Markovian character of a typical evolution. Randomizing only the measuring apparatus/environment part, we were able to derive exact expressions for the average decoherence factor and the, so-called, super-fidelity (an upper bound on a state fidelity) in terms of the measured observable level spacings $|a - a'|$, showing an initial decay with a timescale $\sim |a - a'|^{-1}$ followed by a partial revival, indicating non-Markovianity.

We believe our findings shed some light on a long standing problem of how to explain the objective character of the everyday world from quantum mechanics. Namely, if indeed most of our observations can be effectively approximated by general von Neumann measurements, then taking into account unavoidable losses and a macroscopic character of such observations, they typically lead to objective results. A yet more realistic, and quite demanding, generalization of our approach would be to consider more general evolutions than the measurement limit, including self-Hamiltonians of both the system and the environment.

Acknowledgements

This work was carried out at the National Quantum Information Centre in Gdańsk. We thank P. Grangier, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki for discussions. JKK and PH acknowledge the financial support of the John Templeton Foundation through the grant ID #56033. EAA is supported by the grant Sonata Bis 2014/14/E/ST2/00020 from National Science Centre. PĆ thanks the Seventh framework programme EU grant RAQUEL No 323970 and the grant PRELUDIUM 2015/17/N/ST2/04047 from National Science Centre.

Appendix A: Average over the Haar distributed unitary transformations U

In this section we will show the proof of Result 1, which we recall for convenience

Result 3. *The decoherence factor for the single copy of the environment average over the Haar distributed unitary transformations $\hat{U}$ is equal to:*

$$\langle |\Gamma_{a,a'}(t)|^2 \rangle_{\hat{\mathcal{U}}} = |\operatorname{Tr}[\hat{D}]|^2 \frac{d - \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_E^2]}{d(d^2-1)} + \frac{d \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_E^2] - 1}{d^2 - 1} \tag{A1}$$

where d is the local dimension of the environment.

We will start from writing the decoherence factor as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{a,a'}(t)|^2 &= |\operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}t}\,\rho_E]|^2 = \operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}t}\,\rho_E]\operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}t}\,\rho_E]^\dagger = \operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}t}\,\rho_E]\operatorname{Tr}[(\mathrm{e}^{-i(a-a')\hat{B}}\,t)^\dagger \rho_E] \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}[\hat{U}\hat{D}\hat{U}^\dagger \rho_E \otimes \hat{U}\hat{D}^\dagger\hat{U}^\dagger \rho_E] = \operatorname{Tr}[(\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger)(\rho_E \otimes \rho_E)(\hat{U}\otimes\hat{U})(\hat{D}\otimes\hat{D}^\dagger)] \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where we have used $\operatorname{Tr} A \operatorname{Tr} B = \operatorname{Tr}[A \otimes B]$ and two, the following, facts in the calculations

Fact 3. *For operators A, B the following is true*

$$|\operatorname{Tr} AB|^2 = \operatorname{Tr} AB \operatorname{Tr}(AB)^\dagger, \tag{A3}$$

where $\dagger$ stands for hermitian conjugation.

Proof.

$$|\operatorname{Tr} AB|^2 = \operatorname{Tr} AB\overline{\operatorname{Tr}(AB)} = \operatorname{Tr} AB\overline{\operatorname{Tr}(A^T B^T)} = \operatorname{Tr} AB \operatorname{Tr}(AB)^\dagger, \tag{A4}$$

where $\overline{X}$ stands for the complex conjugation of X and we used $\operatorname{Tr} X = \operatorname{Tr} X^T$, and $\overline{X^T} = X^\dagger$. □

Fact 4. *For operators A, B and the SWAP operator $\mathbb{V}$, we have that:*

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\mathbb{V}(A\otimes B)] = \operatorname{Tr}(AB). \tag{A5}$$

Proof. We present here proof for a bi-partite *SWAP* operator, but it could be generalized to any dimension. Let us write *SWAP* as:

$$\mathbb{V} = \sum_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ji| \tag{A6}$$

Inserting (A6) into (A5) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}[\mathbb{V}(A\otimes B)] &= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\sum_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ji| A\otimes B\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\sum_{ij}\langle ji| A\otimes B|ij\rangle\right) \\ &= \sum_{ijkl}\langle ji|A|kl\rangle\langle kl|B|ij\rangle = \operatorname{Tr}(AB) \end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

□

The thing that we are left with is to perform the average of the Haar distributed unitary transformations $\hat{U}$. To do this, we will use the well-know result from the group-theory, namely that

Fact 5. *For a hermitian operator X from $\mathcal{C}^d$, its bipartite Haar integral is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}}\, \hat{U}\otimes\hat{U} X \otimes X \hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger &= \int \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}}\, \hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger X \otimes X\hat{U}\otimes\hat{U} \\ &= \frac{2}{d(d+1)} \operatorname{Tr}[\Pi_{sym} A\otimes A]\Pi_{sym} + \frac{2}{d(d-1)} \operatorname{Tr}[\Pi_{asym} A\otimes A]\Pi_{asym}, \end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

where Π_{sym} and Π_{asym} are the orthogonal projectors onto the symmetric and antisymmetric subspaces, respectively, equal to

$$\Pi_{sym} = \frac{\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{V}}{2}, \Pi_{asym} = \frac{\mathbb{I}-\mathbb{V}}{2}, \tag{A9}$$

where $\mathbb{V}$ is the SWAP operator.

In our case, $A \otimes A$ is just $\rho_E \otimes \rho_E$ and then we can easily calculate $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathrm{sym}}\rho_E \otimes \rho_E]\Pi_{\mathrm{sym}}$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathrm{asym}}\rho_E \otimes \rho_E]\Pi_{\mathrm{asym}}$ using Facts 3 and 4. These two factors are equal to

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathrm{sym}}\rho_E \otimes \rho_E]\Pi_{\mathrm{sym}} = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{V})(\rho_E \otimes \rho_E)\right]\frac{\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{V}}{2} = \frac{1+\mathrm{Tr}[{\rho_E}^2]}{2}\frac{\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{V}}{2}, \tag{A10}$$

and for the antisymmetric projector

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathrm{asym}}\rho_E \otimes \rho_E]\Pi_{\mathrm{asym}} = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathbb{I}-\mathbb{V})(\rho_E \otimes \rho_E)\right]\frac{\mathbb{I}-\mathbb{V}}{2} = \frac{1-\mathrm{Tr}[{\rho_E}^2]}{2}\frac{\mathbb{I}-\mathbb{V}}{2}. \tag{A11}$$

We can now insert the results of the averages from Fact 5 and Eqs (A10) and (A11) into Eq. (A2), and again using Facts 3 and 4 to calculate $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{I} \pm \mathbb{V})\hat{D} \otimes \hat{D}^\dagger$, keeping in mind that $\hat{D}$ is hermitian and then $\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger = d$, prove our result, namely that the decoherence factor averaged over Haar distributed unitaries $\hat{U}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\langle|\Gamma_{a,a'}(t)|^2\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \int \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger\rho \otimes \rho\hat{U} \otimes \hat{U}\hat{D} \otimes \hat{D}^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\int \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathcal{U}}\hat{U} \otimes \hat{U}\rho \otimes \rho\hat{U}^\dagger \otimes \hat{U}^\dagger\right)\hat{D} \otimes \hat{D}^\dagger\right] \\ &= |\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{D}|^2\frac{d-\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_E^2]}{d(d^2-1)} + \frac{d\,\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_E^2]-1}{d^2-1}\end{aligned} \tag{A12}$$

Using similar techniques, one can also prove the result for the orthogonalization factor, starting from the fidelity definition in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

Appendix B: Details of averaging over environments

The task is to find the following average:

$$I(d,\Delta) = \langle\sum_{i<j}\cos(\Delta(\lambda_i-\lambda_j))\rangle = \sum_{i<j}\int d\boldsymbol{\lambda}\; p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\cos(\Delta(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)) \tag{B1}$$

Where d is the dimension of each environment E_k. We use the GUE eigenvalue distribution for the λ's.

$$p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{Z}e^{-\eta_E\sum\lambda_k^2}\prod_{i<j}|\lambda_j-\lambda_i|^2 \tag{B2}$$

Where η_E is the eigenvalue scale of the environments $\hat{B}_k$, and Z is a normalization constant (Partition Function). If we define the Harmonic Oscillator Wave Functions:

$$\psi_n(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sqrt{2\pi}n!}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}}He_n(x) \tag{B3}$$

Such that $\int dx\;\psi_n(x)\psi_m(x) = \delta_{nm}$, then the GUE eigenvalue distribution takes on a very compact and elegant form [30] (6.2.4)

$$p(\boldsymbol{\lambda})d\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \frac{1}{d!}\det[\psi_{j-1}(\zeta_i)]^2 d\boldsymbol{\zeta} \tag{B4}$$

where $\lambda_k = \frac{\zeta_k}{\sqrt{2\eta_E}}$.

1. Exploiting the Symmetry

A crucial step is the realization that this average has an index permutation symmetry. Let $\sigma \in S_d$, be a permutation, then:

$$p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \ldots, \lambda_d) = p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = p(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \lambda_{\sigma(2)}, \lambda_{\sigma(3)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(d)}) \tag{B5}$$

$$\sum_{i<j} \cos(\Delta(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)) = \sum_{i<j} \cos(\Delta(\lambda_{\sigma(i)} - \lambda_{\sigma(j)})) \tag{B6}$$

This is because the inner functions are symmetric, and because in both of these functions all pairs of indices are taken (i.e. the product or sum is over all $i < j$). Equivalently, one can recall that $\mathrm{Tr}[D] = \sum \mathrm{e}^{-\mathbf{i}\Delta\lambda_k}$, so that the function being averaged is clearly symmetric under permutations. Hence, the calculation of the average $I(d, \Delta)$ reduces to a single term:

$$I(d, \Delta) = \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \int d\boldsymbol{\lambda}\ p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \cos(\Delta(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)) \tag{B7}$$

And the integrand only depends on two variables, so we can take the marginal distribution, which is essentially the 2-point correlation function, defined as: [30] (6.1.2)

$$R_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{d!}{(d-2)!} \int d\lambda_3 d\lambda_4 \cdots d\lambda_d\ p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_d) \tag{B8}$$

Hence, we have reduced the problem to:

$$I(d, \Delta) = \frac{1}{2} \int d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2\ R_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \cos(\Delta(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)) \tag{B9}$$

2. A Crucial Integral

Here we calculate the Integral:

$$J_{n,m}(\alpha) = \int dx\ \psi_n(x)\psi_m(x)e^{\mathbf{i}\alpha x} \tag{B10}$$

Without loss of generality, we will assume $m \geq n$. First we express the wavefunctions as Hermite polynomials. Then, the trick is to use the Generating function of the polynomials, with parameters r, s to perform the integral.

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{n,m}(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n! m!}} \int dx\ H_n(x)H_m(x)e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2 + \mathbf{i}\alpha x} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n! m!}} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial r^n}\bigg|_{r=0} \frac{\partial^m}{\partial s^m}\bigg|_{s=0} \int dx\ e^{(\mathbf{i}\alpha + r + s)x - \frac{1}{2}(r^2 + s^2 + x^2)} \\
&= \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2}}{\sqrt{n! m!}} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial r^n}\bigg|_{r=0} \frac{\partial^m}{\partial s^m}\bigg|_{s=0} e^{\mathbf{i}\alpha r + \mathbf{i}\alpha s + rs} \\
&= \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2}}{\sqrt{n! m!}} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial r^n}\bigg|_{r=0} (\mathbf{i}\alpha + r)^m e^{\mathbf{i}\alpha r}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use the binomial equation for derivatives $\frac{d^n}{dx^n} f(x)g(x) = \sum \binom{n}{k} \frac{d^{n-k} f(x)}{dx^{n-k}} \frac{d^k g(x)}{dx^k}$, and since $m \geq n$ we don't run into any unexpected problems.

$$J_{n,m}(\alpha) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2}}{\sqrt{n! m!}} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \binom{m}{k} k! (\mathbf{i}\alpha)^{n+m-2k} \tag{B11}$$

3. Putting the Result Together

We shall also use $\Delta = \sqrt{2A}\tilde{\Delta}$,and pass to more friendly notation $(x, y) = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$. Hence, we will have:

$$I(d, \Delta) = \frac{1}{2} \int dxdy \; R_2(x, y) \cos(\tilde{\Delta}(x - y)) \tag{B12}$$

Now, Dyson's Theorem will tell us how to calculate the 2-point correlation function. [30] Thm 5.14 , eq(6.2.6+7) We shall need to define first the following function:

$$K(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \psi_j(x)\psi_j(y) \tag{B13}$$

And so, the 2 point correlation function is simply:

$$R_2(x, y) = K(x, x)K(y, y) - K(x, y)^2 \tag{B14}$$

Hence, we can express our integral as the following sum:

$$I(d, \Delta) = \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} \int dxdy \; \left(\psi_n(x)^2\psi_m(y)^2 - \psi_n(x)\psi_m(x)\psi_n(y)\psi_m(y)\right) \cos(\tilde{\Delta}(x - y)) \tag{B15}$$

By expressing the cosine function in exponential form, the integrals become separable, and we can obtain:

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} \left(A_{n,m} + \tilde{A}_{n,m} - 2B_{n,m}\right) \tag{B16}$$

Where we define the auxiliary functions:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n,m} &= J_{n,n}(\tilde{\Delta})J_{m,m}(-\tilde{\Delta}) \\ \tilde{A}_{n,m} &= J_{n,n}(-\tilde{\Delta})J_{m,m}(\tilde{\Delta}) \\ B_{n,m} &= J_{n,m}(\tilde{\Delta})J_{n,m}(-\tilde{\Delta}) \end{aligned}$$

And

$$J_{n,m}(\tilde{\Delta}) = \int dx \; \psi_n(x)\psi_m(x)e^{\mathbf{i}\tilde{\Delta}x}$$

Now, we are able to separate the n, m summation into three: $\{n < m, n = m, n > m\}$. From the definition of the auxiliary functions, we easily see that the diagonal summation $(n = m)$ vanishes. And in fact both sum $n < m$ and $n > m$ become the same, since $A_{m,n} = \tilde{A}_{n,m}$ and $B_{m,n} = B_{n,m}$. Hence, for convenience we will take $m > n$ only. Next, we use the explicit result of the J integral:

$$A_{n,m} = e^{-\tilde{\Delta}^2} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{m} \binom{n}{k} \binom{m}{l} \frac{(-1)^{n+m-k-l}\tilde{\Delta}^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(n-k)!(m-l)!} \tag{B17}$$

And by doing the same for $\tilde{A}$, we indeed realize $A_{n,m} = \tilde{A}_{n,m}$. For B, we get:

$$B_{n,m} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \binom{m}{l} \frac{(-1)^{k+l}\tilde{\Delta}^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(m-k)!(n-l)!} \tag{B18}$$

Hence, putting it all together (with a factor of 2, since now we only sum $m > n$), we obtain:

$$I(d, \Delta) = e^{-\tilde{\Delta}^2} \sum_{n=0}^{d-2} \sum_{m=n+1}^{d-1} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{m} \binom{n}{k} \binom{m}{l} \frac{(-1)^{n+m-k-l}\tilde{\Delta}^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(n-k)!(m-l)!} - \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \binom{m}{l} \frac{(-1)^{k+l}\tilde{\Delta}^{2(n+m-k-l)}}{(m-k)!(n-l)!} \right] \tag{B19}$$

Notice that in the main text we do not directly use $I(d,\Delta)$ but rather separate its Gaussian and polynomial parts (i.e. $I(d,\Delta) = \mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{\Delta}^2}\, p(d,\tilde{\Delta})$).

Appendix C: Short Time Analysis

In this section, we will explicitly calculate the coefficients of the constant, quadratic, and highest order term in $p(d,\tilde{\Delta})$.

The constant term occurs when $k+l = m+n$, but this can only occur in the first summand of the polynomial when $k=n$ and $l=m$, so that we have:

$$\sum_{n<m}[1] = \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \tag{C1}$$

The quadratic term occurs when the indices fulfil the condition $k+l+1 = m+n$. On the first term, this can occur if ($k=n$, $l=m-1$) or if ($k=n-1$, $l=m$). On the second term this can occur only when the m index is $m+1$ and the inner indices are $k=l=n$. Thus we obtain:

$$\sum_{n<m}\left[m(-1)\tilde{\Delta}^2\right] + \sum_{n<m}\left[n(-1)\tilde{\Delta}^2\right] - \sum_{n}\left[(n+1)\tilde{\Delta}^2\right] = -\frac{d^2(d-1)}{2}\tilde{\Delta}^2 \tag{C2}$$

Thus, for short time scales we have the approximation:

$$p(d,\tilde{\Delta}) = \frac{d(d-1)}{2}\left(1 - d\tilde{\Delta}^2\right) + O(\tilde{\Delta}^4). \tag{C3}$$

To proceed further, we first upperbound it by a Gaussian function, using $1-\Delta^2 \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\Delta^2}$. Then the macrofraction powers of the averages (30,31) can be approximated by:

$$\left[c + \frac{d(d-1)}{2}\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\Delta^2}\right]^{N_f} = \sum_{k=0}^{N_f}\binom{N_f}{k} c^{N_f-k}\left[\frac{d(d-1)}{2}\alpha\right]^k \mathrm{e}^{-k(d+1)\Delta^2} \approx c^{N_f} + \frac{d(d-1)}{2}N_f c^{N_f-1}\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\Delta^2}, \tag{C4}$$

where c, α are the respective constant and the multiplicative factor from (30) or (31) and we have kept only the most significant terms in the last step. Wigner surmise (35) integration is then elementary and yields:

$$\int ds P_{Wig}(s)\left[c + \frac{d(d-1)}{2}\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\Delta^2}\right]^{N_f} \approx c^{N_f} + \frac{d(d-1)}{2}N_f c^{N_f-1}\alpha\left(1 + \frac{d+1}{\eta_s\eta_E}t^2\right)^{-3/2}. \tag{C5}$$

Taylor expanding the last term in t and again upperbounding by a Gaussian we obtain:

$$\left(1 + \frac{d+1}{\eta_s\eta_E}t^2\right)^{-3/2} \approx 1 - \frac{3(d+1)}{2\eta_s\eta_E}t^2 \leq \exp\left(-\frac{3(d+1)}{2\eta_s\eta_E}t^2\right). \tag{C6}$$

Appendix D: Upperbounding the exact expressions (30,31)

The expressions (30,31) are algebraically complicated and some simplified expressions, reproducing short- and long-time behavior and preferably upper bounding (30,31) would be desirable. Here we attempt a construction of such an upper bound. For short times, we may neglect in the average $\langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle = p(d,\tilde{\Delta}_t)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\tilde{\Delta}_t^2}$ (27,28) all terms except the first two giving $\langle f_t(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\rangle \leq [d(d-1)/2]\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\tilde{\Delta}_t^2}$ (see Appendix C). On the other hand, for large times the highest order term $\tilde{\Delta}^{2(2d-3)}$ dominates and it always comes with a negative coefficient. These observations suggest

the following Ansatz:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{a,a'}(t) \equiv \frac{1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle}{d+1} + \frac{d-\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle}{d+1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\tilde{\Delta}^2}, \tag{D1}$$

$$\tilde{G}_{a,a'}(t) \equiv \langle S_{lin}(\rho_E)\rangle + \frac{1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle}{d+1} + \frac{d\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle - 1}{d+1}\,\mathrm{e}^{-(d+1)\tilde{\Delta}^2}, \tag{D2}$$

for the decoherence and the superfidelity factors respectively. By construction, the expressions (D1,D2) reproduce the correct short time behavior as $\langle \Gamma_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{a,a'}(t) + O(t^4)$, and similarly $\langle G_{a,a'}(t)\rangle_{gue}$, for $t \ll \tau_{dec}$, where $\tau_{a,a'}$ is the characteristic time of the Gaussian decay in (D1,D2):

$$\tau_{a,a'} \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2\eta_E}}{\sqrt{d+1}|a-a'|}. \tag{D3}$$

They are also upper bounds since $1 - x \leq \mathrm{e}^{-x}$ (cf. (C3)). Similarly, for long times $t \gg \tau_{a,a'}$, (D1,D2) reproduce the correct white noise factor $(1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle)/(d+1)$ and also upper bound the exact averages, since $p(d,\tilde{\Delta}_t)$ is then negative. These two facts together suggest that (D1,D2) may be upper bounds for all times t and dimensions d. Unfortunately we were unable to prove it analytically, but numerical evidence for $d \leq 20$ suggests that it is indeed so. In Fig. 3 we present some sample plots of both (30,31) and (D1,D2) together with the errors. The price to pay for working with the simplified expressions (D1,D2) is that one loses the important physical information on non-Markovianity, reflected by the non-monotonic behaviour of the exact averages. Also the exact functions approach their asymptotic limits from below, signalizing recovery of coherences/loss of information in the environment, while (D1,D2) approach them from above. However, if one is solely interested in an SBS formation, an upper bound decaying to the correct noise level is just enough.

To finish, we present Wigner surmise (35) averages of Ansatz (D1,D1):

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{uno}_{a,a'}(t)\rangle\rangle &= \frac{1}{(d+1)^{N_{uno}}}\sum_{k=0}^{N_{uno}}\binom{N_{uno}}{k}\left(1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle\right)^{N_{uno}-k} \\ &\times \left(d-\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle\right)^{k}\left(1+k\frac{d+1}{\eta_s\eta_E}t^2\right)^{-3/2},\end{aligned} \tag{D4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle \tilde{G}^{mac}_{a,a'}(t)\rangle\rangle &= \frac{1}{(d+1)^{N_{mac}}}\sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=N_{mac}}\binom{N_{mac}}{k_1,k_2,k_3}\langle S_{lin}(\rho_E)\rangle^{k_1} \\ &\times \left(1+\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle\right)^{k_2}\left(d\langle \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_E^2\rangle - 1\right)^{k_3}\left(1+k_3\frac{d+1}{\eta_s\eta_E}t^2\right)^{-3/2},\end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

where $\binom{N}{k_1,k_2,k_3}$ is the multinomial coefficient.

The so averaged Ansatz approach to the noise floor is no longer exponential as in the partial averages (30,31) but polynomial, of the order $\sim 1/t^3$ for large times. This is a consequence of the assumed GUE distribution, especially the Wigner surmise (35) used at the end. The speed of this approach is controlled primarily by the effective interaction strength $1/\eta_S\eta_E$, and the *classical* dimension of the respective macrofraction $d \times N_f$. The latter is due to the lack of direct interactions between the environments.

[1] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
[2] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Nat. Phys. **5**, 222 (2011).
[3] J. Åberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 150402 (2014).
[4] M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021001 (2015).
[5] M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Nat. Commun. **6**, 6383 (2015).
[6] P. Ćwikliński, M. Studziński, M. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 210403 (2015).
[7] V. Narasimhachar and G. Gour, Nat. Commun. **6**, 7689 (2014).
[8] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, Science **299**, 862 (2003).
[9] M. Asano, I. Basieva, A. Khrennikov, M. Ohya, Y. Tanaka, and I. Yamato, Found. Phys. **45**, 1362 (2015).



(a) $d = 2$ (b) $d = 2$

(c) $d = 8$ (d) $d = 8$

FIG. 3: (Color online). In figures (a) and (c) the dotted (red) curve represents the Ansatz $\tilde{\Gamma}(t)$, the solid (black) line represents the exact function $\langle\Gamma(t)\rangle$, and the dashed (blue) curve the difference $\tilde{\Gamma}(t) - \langle\Gamma(t)\rangle$. Similarly, in (b) and (d) the dotted (red) curve represents the Ansatz $\tilde{F}(t)$, the solid (black) line represents the exact function $\langle F(t)\rangle$, and the dashed (blue) curve the difference $\tilde{F}(t) - \langle F(t)\rangle$. The timescale is given in units of $\tilde{\Delta} = (a - a')t/\sqrt{2\eta_E}$, and the Bures average purity (24) is used throughout.

[10] N. Lambert, Y.-N. Chen, Y.-C. C. Cheng, C.-M. Li, G.-Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Nat. Phys. **9**, 10 (2013).
[11] H. Lee, Y.-C. Cheng, and G. R. Fleming, Science **316**, 1462 (2007).
[12] G. S. Engel, T. R. Calhoun, E. L. Read, T. K. Ahn, T. Mančal, Y. C. Cheng, R. E. Blankenship, and G. R. Fleming, Nature **446**, 782 (2008).
[13] F. Dubin, R. Melet, T. Barisien, R. Grousson, L. Legrand, M. Schott, and V. Voliotis, Nat. Phys. **2**, 32 (2006).
[14] Y. Nakamura, Y. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai, Nature **398**, 786 (1999).
[15] C. H. van der Wal, A. C. J. ter Haar, F. K. Wilhelm, R. N. Schouten, C. J. P. M. Harmans, T. P. Orlando, S. Lloyd, and J. E. Mooij, Science **290**, 773 (2000).
[16] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[17] M. Oszmaniec, A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, and A. Wójcik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 110403 (2016).
[18] W. H. Zurek, Nat. Phys. **5**, 181 (2009).
[19] J. K. Korbicz, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120402 (2014).
[20] R. Horodecki, J. K. Korbicz, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032122 (2015).
[21] W. H. Zurek, Physics Today **44**, 36 (1991).
[22] M. A. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the Quantum-To-Classical Transition* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2007).
[23] J. Halliwell, J. Perez-Mercader, and W. Żurek, *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994).
[24] F. G. S. L. Brandao, M. Piani, and P. Horodecki, Nat. Commun. **6** (2015).
[25] J. Tuziemski and J. K. Korbicz, EPL **112**, 40008 (2015).
[26] J. Tuziemski and J. K. Korbicz, Photonics **2**, 228 (2015).
[27] J. Tuziemski and J. K. Korbicz, ArXiv e-prints (2016), 1603.04217.
[28] P. Mironowicz, J. Korbicz, and P. Horodecki, ArXiv e-prints (2016), 1607.02478.
[29] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg,, Berlin, Heidelberg :, 2010).

[30] M. L. Mehta, *Random matrices* (Academic Press, Boston, New York, San Diego, 1991).
[31] F. G. S. L. Brandão, P. Ćwikliński, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, J. K. Korbicz, and M. Mozrzymas, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 031101 (2012).
[32] L. Masanes, A. J. Roncaglia, and A. Acin, Phys Rev E **87**, 032137 (2013), arXiv:1108.0374.
[33] J. A. Miszczak, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, A. Uhlmann, and K. Życzkowski, Quantum Info. Comput. **9**, 103 (2009).
[34] T. Gorin, C. Pineda, H. Kohler, and T. H. Seligman, New Journal of Physics **10**, 115016 (2008).
[35] M. Carrera, T. Gorin, and T. H. Seligman, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 022107 (2014).
[36] M. Žnidarič, C. Pineda, and I. García-Mata, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 080404 (2011).
[37] D. Braun, F. Haake, and W. T. Strunz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2913 (2001).
[38] W. T. Strunz, F. Haake, and D. Braun, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022101 (2003).
[39] W. T. Strunz and F. Haake, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022102 (2003).
[40] V. Yukalov, Ann. Phys. **327**, 253 (2012).
[41] S. Banerjee and R. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 042105 (2000).
[42] W.-g. Wang, J. Gong, G. Casati, and B. Li, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012108 (2008).
[43] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1955).
[44] A. Auffèves and P. Grangier, Found. Phys. **46**, 121 (2016).
[45] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 2818 (1996).
[46] R. Jozsa, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2315 (1994).
[47] H. Sommers and K. Życzkowski, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, 8457 (2004).
[48] F. Galve, R. Zambrini, and S. Maniscalco, ArXiv e-prints (2014), 1412.3316.
[49] D. Chruściński and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120404 (2014).
[50] P. Mazurek, K. Roszak, R. W. Chhajlany, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 062318 (2014).
[51] P. Mazurek, K. Roszak, and P. Horodecki, EPL **107**, 67004 (2014).
[52] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).